




Ken Wagner, Ph.D.  
Commissioner

State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations  
**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**  
Shepard Building  
255 Westminster Street  
Providence, Rhode Island 02903-3400

Enclosure 6a6  
January 29, 2019

January 29, 2019

**TO:** Members of the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education

**FROM:** Ken Wagner, Ph.D., Commissioner 

**RE:** Approval of Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter Renewal

---

RECOMMENDATION:

**THAT, the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to renew the charter of Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy for 3 years, with sustainability conditions. These sustainability conditions are due within the 2019 calendar year, may require an interim site visit, and may require the charter to report directly to the Council on its progress in meeting the conditions. The term begins with school year 2019-20 and expires at the end of school year 2021-22.**

Enclosed Documents:

The following documents provide further detail regarding the Commissioner's recommendation and analysis contributing to that recommendation:

- Commissioner's Recommendation Overview: including an overview of the charter.
- RIDE's Renewal Report: containing detailed information regarding the performance of the charter and findings as a result of the renewal site visit.
- Charter's Response: including additional information and context provided independently by the charter in regards to the renewal recommendation and report.
- Annual Performance Dashboards: containing detail on performance ratings for each school and each year of the charter's term.



# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy

## Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation

### Recommendation: 3-Year Renewal, with Sustainability Conditions

#### Renewal Recommendation Overview:

Summary of Recommendation	
Recommended Action:	<b>The Commissioner recommends that the Council on Elementary and Secondary Education move to <u>renew</u> the charter of Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy for <u>3 years</u>, with sustainability conditions. These sustainability conditions are due within the 2019 calendar year, may require an interim site visit, and may require the charter to report directly to the Council on its progress in meeting the conditions.</b>
Recommended Charter Term:	From SY2019-20 through SY2021-22
Recommended Sustainability Conditions:	<p>The time-bound sustainability conditions address the charter's specific issues and deficiencies found throughout the renewal process. In addition to meeting the expectations of each renewal condition, Times<sup>2</sup> may be required to present its progress in meeting the conditions to the Council. The Commissioner, with the advice and consent of the Council, reserves the authority to take action, as outlined in the charter school regulations section 2.5 (200-RICR-20-05-2.2.5), should the charter not meet the expectations of the required renewal conditions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Within the next six months and <u>no later than June 30, 2019</u>, Times<sup>2</sup> must <b>identify a change manager</b> and <b>provide a detailed plan</b> demonstrating how the charter will meet the needs of all students and fulfill its mission. The plan must be <b>approved by RIDE</b> and must include:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Systems and structures to identify, support and serve special education students.</li> <li>Systems and structures to identify, support and serve English Learners including meeting all stipulations found in the agreement between the US DOJ and PPSD for serving ELs.</li> <li>Rigorous academic progress monitoring for all students across school levels, among administrators and board members.</li> <li>Consistent and integrated STEM education across all grades.</li> <li>Aligned curriculum to statewide standards for core content areas in all grades.</li> <li>Systems and structures to review recruitment procedures and results to ensure efforts reach all students in the sending district.</li> <li>Decision-making and communication protocols and procedures, that have the support of staff, to address stakeholder complaints and human resource management for both teachers and administrators.</li> <li>If the charter plans to contract with another provider for student support, or other services, Times<sup>2</sup> must establish a time-bound agreement with the provider(s) that clarifies all management, operational, student support and other services:                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The agreement must specify costs for services provided, whether in-kind, annual contracts, hourly, salaried, etc.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>Within the next twelve months and <u>no later than December 31, 2019</u>, Times<sup>2</sup> must <b>provide evidence of plan implementation</b> including action steps taken, documentation, and results.</li> <li><b>Ongoing progress reports will be required</b> for the duration of the charter's term. The reports must detail Times<sup>2</sup>'s progress toward satisfying each condition and must include applicable evidence. The progress reports will be <u>due thirty days after the end of each fiscal quarter</u>, beginning with Q3FY19.</li> <li>Within the next twelve months and <u>no later than December 31, 2019</u>, Times<sup>2</sup> must have a complete <b>financial audit for FY19</b> that is free of all significant deficiencies and material weaknesses.</li> </ol>



## Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation

### Recommendation: 3-Year Renewal, with Sustainability Conditions

<p>Recommendation Key Points:</p>	<p><b>Academic Performance</b></p> <p>The school's academic performance has been mixed, with the outcomes of the most recent year resulting in a School Performance rating of Approaches, and a School Comparison Rating of Approaches. The school received a 2-star rating due to low achievement and growth, approaching expectations for School Performance. For achievement, the school earned 1 point (out of 4) for Math (13% proficient) and ELA (20% proficient). This triggered an analysis for the School Comparison sub-indicator, which includes three criteria (Sending District Comparison, EL Progress, Growth). The school approached expectations on all criteria, resulting in an overall school comparison rating of Approaches. Since the school approached expectations on the school comparison sub-indicator in the most recent year, it received a Tier 3 final designation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school approached expectations in the Sending District Comparison. The school did not reliably (accounting for standard error) outperform the weighted average proficiency of its sending district in either subject.</li> <li>• The school approached expectations for EL Progress. The school earned 2 ELP points (out of 4), its ELP Index score was 78 (out of 110), with 59% of ELs meeting the progress target.</li> <li>• The school approached expectations in growth, earning only 1 point for growth (out of 3) in ELA (growth index of 0.78 out of 2) and 2 points in Math (growth index of 0.87 out of 2).</li> </ul> <p><b>Organizational Performance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The school approached expectations on organizational criterion 2.3, Equity and Access, due recruitment efforts that do not address all populations in the sending district.</li> <li>• The school did not meet expectations in criterion 2.5, Board and Leadership Quality. There was not evidence of regular academic progress monitoring, nor clear or well-understood systems for decision-making. There was a vote of no confidence in the Executive Director given to the school's Board by the school's faculty in June of 2017.</li> </ul> <p><b>Compliance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Special Education</u>: After an investigation by RIDE, the school was found to be in violation of implementing a student's IEP in 2017-18. While the specific violation has since been resolved, there is not a clear system in place to ensure IEP services are provided with fidelity and consistency.</li> <li>• <u>EL Services</u>: While the school had initiated a request for technical assistance from RIDE to correct their EL services, the United States Department of Justice conducted a thorough review of Providence Public Schools' EL programs and services in early 2018. This review found several conditions of the district's EL programming that violate Section 1703(f) of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act. The settlement agreement outlines several matters that must be addressed across PPSD schools, including Times<sup>2</sup>.</li> <li>• <u>Educational Program</u>: During the site visit, there was a lack of STEM integration across all grade levels, and the elementary scheduled resulted in limited science instruction on a weekly basis. The middle/high school visit encountered students without coherent schedules. Additionally, there was not evidence that the school has aligned curriculum to statewide standards for all core subjects at all levels.</li> <li>• <u>Financial Management</u>: Over the course of the term, the charter has struggled to provide required financial reports on time, and the school's auditors identified several significant deficiencies and material weaknesses, which have carried over through fiscal years.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--



# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy

## Overview of Commissioner's Charter Renewal Recommendation

### Recommendation: 3-Year Renewal, with Sustainability Conditions

#### Charter Overview:

Current Charter Overview			
Charter Type	District	2017-18 Grades Served	K-12
School-Year Opened	1998-99	2017-18 Enrollment	726
Current Charter Term	2014/15 – 2018/19	Authorized Enrollment	727 (grades K-12)
Enrolling Communities	Providence	Location(s)	Providence (Elementary and Middle/High Schools are co-located)
Network Status	The charter moving forward will be considered a network charter with two individual schools and will receive separate accountability ratings		

School Mission and Model	
School Mission:	The mission of Times <sup>2</sup> STEM Academy is “to develop intellectually curious and capable young people who are selfless contributors to the local and global community, and who aspire to be ethical and compassionate leaders. Through a rigorous and innovative academic program in math Science, and technology, in combination with the liberal arts, Times <sup>2</sup> Academy affords it diverse student populations those experiences, skills and values that will prepare them for purposeful contribution to higher education and STEM related fields and meaningful personal growth.”
School Model:	Times <sup>2</sup> began as an afterschool and Saturday enrichment program and its program continues to focus on developing minority students into STEM sector leaders and innovators. Times <sup>2</sup> is a district charter school, composed of two levels, the Elementary School (grades K-6) and the Middle/High School (grades 7-12). While the levels are co-located in a connected building, the levels operate independently with separate school principals, deans and teachers, as well as separate entrances, and office staff.

#### Overview of Charter Performance Ratings:

The following table depicts the charter's performance according to the Charter Performance Review System. For more detail on performance ratings, please see the charter's renewal report and annual performance dashboards.

Times <sup>2</sup> STEM Academy					
Indicators		SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Academic	(1A) School Performance	NR	M	M	A
	(1B) School Comparison	-	NR	NR	A
Sustainability	(1) Financial	-	M	M	M
	(2) Organizational	-	M	M	A
	(3) Compliance	-	DNM	A	DNM
Renewal Process Tier		Tier 3. In-Depth Renewal Process			
Updated Tier Designation		Tier 3 (Academic, Organizational, Compliance)			

Ratings Key	
E	Exceeds Expectations
M	Meets Expectations
A	Approaches Expectations
DNM	Does Not Meet Expectations
NR	Not Rated
NA	Not Applicable

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

### ABOUT THIS REPORT

---

In 2015, RIDE embarked on a process to revise the existing charter performance framework based on lessons learned over 5 years of implementation and alignment to national best practice. The updated [Charter School Performance Review System](#) was created in collaboration with a committee of charter school practitioners and the National Association of Charter School Authorizers. The purpose of the revision was to increase transparency of charter performance review, provide clarity on charter's performance annually, and ensure consistency of decisions that prioritize the school's academic performance. The 2016-17 school year was the first year of implementation, and all charter schools received 2015-16 performance ratings applied retroactively to initiate the new performance framework.

This report comprises performance ratings for the previous three years of the charter's term (2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18). The 2014-15 school year, the first year of the current charter term, is not rated due to the transition of both the charter performance review system and the statewide assessment. Performance ratings utilize data from school-generated annual reports and other RIDE monitoring results. As part of the renewal process, RIDE provided initial renewal tier designations, based off the two most recent years of available data, to inform the renewal process. The final tier designation is updated based on results from the 2017-18 school year.

Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy (Times<sup>2</sup>) initially received a "Tier 3" designation due to compliance with financial management criteria and followed the in-depth renewal process. The renewal site visit was conducted over a three-day period in late March and early April 2018. To prepare for the site visit, the team, comprised of RIDE staff from the Office of College and Career Readiness, reviewed the charter's performance reports to date, the charter's renewal application, and programmatic and organizational documentation submitted by the school. The site visit consisted of classroom observations and interviews with the charter school board, all members of the school's leadership team, teachers, parents, and students representing the Elementary and Middle/High School. The site visit is an integral part of the team's ability to corroborate information provided by the charter school, follow up on areas of the school's operations that are not meeting performance expectations and ensure the team has gathered information to help determine performance ratings for the Organizational and Compliance Indicators.

As one of the longest operating charters in Rhode Island, Times<sup>2</sup> was authorized as a single charter with one school code, and as they grew the school levels remained under the same school code for accountability purposes. Historically, RIDE has held them accountable and reported their school data as a single charter school and for consistency, RIDE is reporting their performance and accountability ratings as a single charter school throughout the remainder of this term. Should the Council renew Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy, RIDE will hold each school accountable (Elementary and Middle/High) as separate schools, consistent with the charter's operations and Rhode Island's ESSA state plan, starting with the first year of the new charter.

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

### CHARTER OVERVIEW

Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy (Times<sup>2</sup>) is a district charter school, composed of two levels, the Elementary School (grades K-6) and the Middle/High School (grades 7-12). While the levels are co-located in a connected building in Providence, the levels operate independently with separate school principals, deans and teachers, as well as separate entrances, and office staff. Times<sup>2</sup> began as an afterschool and Saturday enrichment program focused on developing minority students into STEM sector leaders and innovators. The charter opened in 1998 with grades 6-12, and expanded in 2002 to grades K-12. In 2015, the charter was approved for a modest expansion to serve an additional 80 students. The charter's current approved enrollment K-12 is 727 students.

The mission of Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy is *"to develop intellectually curious and capable young people who are selfless contributors to the local and global community, and who aspire to be ethical and compassionate leaders. Through a rigorous and innovative academic program in math Science, and technology, in combination with the liberal arts, Times<sup>2</sup> Academy affords it diverse student populations those experiences, skills and values that will prepare them for purposeful contribution to higher education and STEM related fields and meaningful personal growth."*

### Enrollment Demographic Information

Descriptive demographics are based on October enrollment data reported to RIDE by the charter school and reported publicly on InfoWorks.

	2014/15	2015/16	2016/17	2017/18
Total Enrollment	653	675	739	726
Free/Reduced Lunch Eligibility	78%	76%	79%	84%
Students Receiving Special Education Services	7%	8%	7%	12%
Students Receiving ESL Services	8%	8%	7%	8%
Multiracial	4%	3%	2%	3%
African-American	30%	28%	28%	28%
Latino/Hispanic	59%	60%	60%	60%
Native American	1%	1%	0%	1%
Asian	2%	1%	2%	2%
White/Caucasian	6%	6%	7%	7%

### PERFORMANCE OVERVIEW

Times<sup>2</sup> received a "Tier 3" final tier designation for the renewal process due to its overall ratings in academic performance, organizational performance and compliance. Times<sup>2</sup> initially received a "Tier 3" designation due to compliance with financial management criteria and followed the in-depth renewal process.

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

In 2015-16 and 2016-17, the charter met expectations for each overall indicator except for Compliance. The school did not meet expectations with financial management compliance criteria related to significant deficiencies and material weaknesses identified by the charter's auditors. In 2017-18 the school approached expectations in School Performance because it received a 2-star rating on the statewide accountability system. As a result, RIDE conducted the School Comparison analysis, which found the school "Approached Expectations." In 2017-18, the school received an overall "Approaches Expectations" rating for organizational performance due to criteria related to recruitment and leadership quality. The school also received an overall "Does Not Meet Expectations" rating for compliance due to significant findings across many criteria in the indicator. In all school years, the charter met expectations for financial performance. Additional information for each indicator and criteria rating is included in this report.

Each indicator's specific criteria ratings inform an overall indicator rating. Each charter receives a detailed annual performance report that identifies ratings for each individual criteria and overall indicators. These performance reports accompany the renewal report.

Indicators		SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Academic	(1A) School Performance	NR	M	M	A
	(1B) School Comparison	-	NR	NR	A
Sustainability	(1) Financial	-	M	M	M
	(2) Organizational	-	M	M	A
	(3) Compliance	-	DNM	A	DNM
Renewal Process Tier		Tier 3. In-Depth Renewal Process			
Updated Tier Designation		Tier 3 (Academic, Organizational, Compliance)			

Ratings Key			
E	Exceeds Expectations	DNM	Does Not Meet Expectations
M	Meets Expectations	NR	Not Rated
A	Approaches Expectations	NA	Not Applicable



# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

### PRIMARY INDICATOR: ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

School Performance			
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Not Rated	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations
<p><b>Summary:</b> Academic data is available for the 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 school years. With the transition to PARCC, the statewide accountability results for the 2014-15 school year were baseline and are not rated in the charter performance system.</p> <p>For the 2015-16 and 2016-17 school years, Times<sup>2</sup> received a CIS score of 75 and 70 (respectively), commensurate with a “leading” level per RIDE’s school classification system under ESEA waiver.</p> <p>In the 2017-18 school year, the school earned two-stars on the statewide accountability system due to overall academic achievement. This triggered the completion of the School Comparison sub-indicator which found the school approached expectations overall, because it approached expectations on all criteria, including not reliably outperforming its sending district.</p> <p>Through a review of documents, the charter’s renewal application, and on-site interviews, there is evidence that the school utilizes internal academic data as well as results on the state assessment to evaluate its student achievement. The school utilizes the NWEA assessment for interim evaluations of student performance in Math and ELA. However, the process and routine for evaluating student academic performance data has been inconsistent over the course of the term. Stakeholders and teachers report differing and changing routines for academic data use among the lower and upper grade levels.</p> <p>It is important to note a rule for statewide accountability regarding schools that span multiple levels. Currently a school is classified at only one level (elementary, middle or high). This is the highest grade the school includes and for which it has sufficient numbers to calculate the metrics. Over the course of this term, Times<sup>2</sup> was classified as a high school.</p>			

School Comparison			
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Not Rated	Not Rated	Not Rated	Approaches Expectations
<p>In 2017-18, RIDE conducted an analysis of the School Comparison sub-indicator due to the school receiving an “Approaches” expectations rating for the School Performance sub-indicator. Based on this analysis, the school was rated as “Approaches” expectations for the School Comparison sub-indicator due to receiving an “Approaches” rating on criteria 1.B.1, 1.B.2 and 1.B.3.</p>			



# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

<p><i>1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts</i></p>	<p>The school “Approached Expectations,” in 2017-18 because the school’s proficiency rate compared to its enrolling district, when accounting for margin of error, is not reliably above its sending district in either subject. Meaning, the school performed about the same (not statistically different) as its sending district in ELA and in Math.</p> <table><tr><th>Subject</th><th>Times2 Proficiency</th><th>± Margin of Error</th><th>Low Range - Margin of Error</th><th>High Range + Margin of Error</th><th>Comparison Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts</th></tr><tr><td>ELA</td><td>20%</td><td>2.9%</td><td>17.1%</td><td>22.9%</td><td>18.42%</td></tr><tr><td>Math</td><td>13%</td><td>2.4%</td><td>10.6%</td><td>15.4%</td><td>12.26%</td></tr></table>	Subject	Times2 Proficiency	± Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Comparison Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts	ELA	20%	2.9%	17.1%	22.9%	18.42%	Math	13%	2.4%	10.6%	15.4%	12.26%
Subject	Times2 Proficiency	± Margin of Error	Low Range - Margin of Error	High Range + Margin of Error	Comparison Weighted Average of Enrolling Districts														
ELA	20%	2.9%	17.1%	22.9%	18.42%														
Math	13%	2.4%	10.6%	15.4%	12.26%														
<p><i>1.B.2 English Language Proficiency</i></p>	<p>The school “Approached Expectations,” in 2017-18 because it earned two ELP points as measured by the statewide accountability system. The school’s ELP index score was 78.</p>																		
<p><i>1.B.3 Growth</i></p>	<p>The school “Approached Expectations,” in 2017-18 because it earned one point for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.78 and two points for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.87.</p>																		

### SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 1

Financial Performance			
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Not Rated	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>The charter received an overall “Meets Expectations” annual rating in Financial Performance for each year of its term. Financial ratings are based primarily on the charter’s audit and therefore, financial information lags a year. For example, financial ratings for 2015-16 are based on the charter’s FY15 audit. Due to the transition of the charter performance review system, the 2014-15 school year is not rated.</p> <p>The organization has had inconsistency in business managers and financial management over the course of the charter term. The current business manager, who began as a consultant in the summer of 2017, is responsible for monitoring the charter’s budget and fiscal health. The board’s treasurer in conjunction with the business manager reports financial items to the board and relies on reports of the Business Manager and audit firm. Please see the Compliance Indicator regarding Financial Management for more information.</p>			

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

<i>1.1 Current Ratio</i>	The charter met expectations each year.
<i>1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash</i>	The charter met expectations each year.
<i>1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio</i>	The charter met expectations each year.
<i>1.4 Total Margin &amp; 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin</i>	The charter met expectations each year.
<i>1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio</i>	The charter met expectations in each applicable year.

## SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 2

Organizational Performance			
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Not Rated	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Approaches Expectations
<b>Summary:</b> All annual ratings and each criteria of this indicator have been rated “Meets or Exceeds Expectations,” in 2015-16 and 2016-17. In 2017-18 criteria 2.3 was rated “Approaches,” and 2.5 was rated “Does Not Meet,” resulting in an overall annual rating of “Approaches Expectations.” Due to the transition of the charter performance review system, the 2014-15 school year is not rated.			
<i>2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals</i>	School-specific goals were not established over the course of this term.		
<i>2.2 School Environment</i>	<p>The charter met or exceeded expectations in this criterion in each applicable year. The school’s attendance rate is part of the performance system for the first time in 2016-17. The charter’s attendance rate in 2017-18 was 93.55%, greater than the state average of 93.24%. Student retention also met expectations with over 80% of students choosing to return to the school each year. Demand for the school is high, and the school’s waitlist has consistently comprised over 50% of available seats.</p> <p>A PTO acts as the main conduit to ensure families are informed of school-based events and updates. The charter’s board and elementary school improvement team</p>		

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

	<p>also include a current parent representative. Through the renewal process, there was some evidence of purposeful parent engagement, such as family nights and a school-wide newsletter; however, parent and family engagement is primarily conducted through parent-teacher conferences twice a year. Outside of conference, communication of students' academic performance varies depending on the grade and teacher. In the middle/high school students can communicate with their teachers via the student information system, Skyward. High school teachers contact parents and families if there is a student problem or academic issue. In the elementary school and middle school grades, teachers are available via cell phone and email, but it is not a requirement.</p> <p>Multiple stakeholder complaints over the course of the charter term, and most frequently in the 2017 and 2018 calendar year present evidence that parent communication and engagement is inconsistent and parent complaints may not be satisfactorily addressed by school leaders and the charter board. A communications protocol is in development by the school leaders. Additionally, the 2018 survey works results show families reporting favorably on measures of engagement declined 17 percentage points to 18%. Students' favorable responses in grades 6-12 are in the lowest percentile for measures of School Climate and School Engagement.</p>
2.3 Equity and Access	<p>Use of attrition data and applicant pool composition were not a factor of this criterion until the 16-17 school year. The charter met expectations in 2015-16 and 2016-17, but approached expectations in 2017-18.</p> <p>The charter's admission's director is responsible for managing the application and lottery processes and working with families who choose to withdraw or not return. Attrition information is reviewed weekly with the Executive Director. The Executive Director has used this information with the Board to support changes to the charter's program; for example, adding high school sports.</p> <p>While interviews with various school stakeholders noted recruitment efforts around the community and participation in the charter school fair, there are not structures in place for reviewing policies and procedures to ensure student recruitment efforts address all populations in the sending district. Interviews with school leadership and the board confirmed that disparities in student demographics as compared to Providence Public Schools have not been analyzed or considered in recruitment efforts.</p>
2.4 Dissemination	<p>The 2016-17 school year is the first year this criterion was evaluated. The charter met expectations in 2016-17 and exceeded expectations in 2017-18. Times<sup>2</sup> Inc. is currently organized into three branches (the Academy, Enrichment and the Institute). The Institute was newly codified at the start of the 2017-18 school year and focuses on offering professional development in STEM for underrepresented populations. The Institute's Director reports out on project progress on a regular basis to the Executive Director and the Charter's board.</p>

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

	<p>Projects from the Institute in the 2017-18 school year included offering professional development in NGSX, SEL and cultural competence around the state, STEM talks RI that are open to anyone to engage under represented populations in STEM, a partnership with Roger Williams to implement the STEM talks model for RI middle and high school students, and presenting at national and local conferences.</p>
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	<p>The charter met expectations in 2015-16 and 2016-17 but did not meet expectations in 2017-18. The board currently has 11 voting members and four members of the executive board including a President, Vice President, Secretary and Treasurer. The board operates committees (development, recruitment, finance, and education) that include board members and community members. Stakeholder interviews confirmed that committees have experienced prolonged periods of inactivity and stakeholder interviews noted that member participation in committees has been sporadic. Board minutes do not support some stakeholder assertions that committees have been consistently active.</p> <p>The board holds the Executive Director accountable through a central, common evaluation tool. Each board member provides their individual evaluations of the ED and in executive session, the full board discuss the ED's evaluation and progress on strategic priorities. The ED conducts evaluations for the Dean of the Elementary School and the Dean of the Middle/High School.</p> <p>There is evidence that the board and school leader do not engage in regular academic progress monitoring. While there is a new strategic plan in place, stakeholders also cited specific strategic planning work at the elementary and second levels. It was not clear how the Board or ED monitor progress against these strategic plans. Board presentations show an annual review of academic data. While some stakeholders stated that the education committee is responsible for reviewing and monitoring academic performance data, there was not agreement among stakeholder interviews regarding the length of existence of the education committee and its role in academic performance monitoring. According to January 2018 board minutes, the education committee was re-established to review the school's academic progress.</p> <p>The board has not implemented clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. This was evident through review of documents and stakeholder interviews. Various stakeholders cited lack of communication, or taking action steps to establish communication protocols with leadership. Through the renewal process, disparities surfaced between the elementary and middle/high school levels for communication protocols, decision-making and process for addressing stakeholder complaints. While the board and school leader cited the committee structure used for decision vetting, board minutes from January of 2018 suggest that committees were formally re-established. Interviews demonstrated that faculty and staff were not aware of any formal policies or procedures around communications or decision-making. During interviews, some staff and administrators discussed work to establish these protocols. Additionally, a vote of no confidence was issued by the faculty of Times2 in June 2018, suggesting that Board and School Leader</p>

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

	have not established clear communication and decision making processes. There is no record of an attempt to communicate with stakeholders to resolve or move forward from this issue.
--	---

### SUSTAINABILITY INDICATOR 3

Compliance			
SY14-15	SY15-16	SY16-17	SY17-18
Not Rated	Does Not Meet Expectations	Approaches Expectations	Does Not Meet Expectations
<b>Summary:</b> Due to the transition of the charter performance review system, the 2014-15 school year is not rated. In 2015-16, the charter did not meet expectations in criteria 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.27 and 3.28 resulting in an overall rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations”. In 2016-17, the charter did not meet expectations in criteria 3.27 and 3.28, resulting in an overall rating of “Approaches Expectations”. In 2017-18, the charter did not meet expectations in criteria 3.2, 3.3, 3.13, 3.14, 3.27 and 3.28, resulting in an overall rating of “Does Not Meet Expectations.”			
<i>Student Rights</i> (3.1 - 3.5)	<p>Over the course of the term, the charter met expectations, with the exception of 3.2 and 3.3 in 2017-18, for each of the criteria associated with student rights, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for monitoring civil rights, special education, English learners, and Title 1. In the 2017-18 school year, the charter did not meet expectations for criteria 3.2. The RIDE Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports found Times<sup>2</sup> to be non-compliant with regard to delivering services documented in a student’s IEP in a timely manner or in an appropriate environment. Providence Public School District is responsible for oversight and monitoring of Times<sup>2</sup>’s program and compliance with requirements related to special education. The school has met the required corrective actions steps over the summer of 2018.</p> <p>In 2017-18, the charter did not meet expectations for criteria 3.3. Times<sup>2</sup> had initiated a request for assistance based on concerns about the screening, evaluation and provision of EL services, particularly the high number of ELs that were waived from EL services due to eligibility for special education services. Times<sup>2</sup> has identified a coordinator for EL services and she has requested technical assistance from the RIDE, Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports. The elementary level has implemented an action plan based on the concerns discovered through technical assistance. Simultaneously, the United States Department of Justice conducted a thorough review of Providence Public Schools’ EL programs and services in early 2018.</p>		

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

	<p>This review found several conditions of the district's EL programming that violate Section 1703(f) of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act. As a district charter school, Times<sup>2</sup> would fall under the agreements reached between the US Department of Justice and the Providence Public Schools for addressing compliance matters of the Consent Decree.</p> <p>The charter has submitted the charter school applicant report each year and its lottery process was monitored in the 2017-18 school year.</p>
<p><i>Employee Management</i> (3.6 - 3.8)</p>	<p>Over the course of the term, the charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with employee management to the various RIDE offices responsible for certification and educator evaluation.</p> <p>While a review of educator evaluation compliance identified inconsistencies with the evaluation data report, the school noted that for 2017-18 it did not have a building administrator complete an evaluation. The elementary administrator was new in the middle of the year and the middle-high administrator has been on leave for the majority of the year. For the following school year, the charter has begun the evaluation process for the elementary school administrator. The middle/high school administrator remains interim.</p> <p>Human resources procedures are documented in the employee handbook through Providence Public Schools. The Business Manager role also includes responsibilities related to human resources.</p>
<p><i>Health and Safety</i> (3.9-3.12)</p>	<p>The charter met expectations for each of the criteria associated with health and safety, according to the various RIDE offices responsible for school health services and food service. The student handbooks includes a code of conduct, bullying, student discipline and safety procedures.</p>
<p><i>Educational Program</i> (3.13-3.16)</p>	<p>The charter met expectations in 2015-16 and 2016-17 but did not meet expectations in 2017-18 for 3.13 Educational Program or 3.14, Aligned Curricula. The site visit team did not observe STEM integration or focus across all grade levels. While the Times<sup>2</sup> Institute is focused on STEM-related professional development, it was not observed as integrated into the instructional program at both levels. Science instruction at the elementary level occurs one to three times per week depending on the grade level and teacher. All students in the middle/high school participate in the school-wide Science Fair, and many compete at the state and national level.</p> <p>The site visit team observed a lack of coherence in student's course schedules at the high school: students in a free period stated they had no space to have a free period and were in the hallway while other classrooms were observed to not have an adult assigned. There was a lack of clarity, according to site visit interviews, as to whether the 6<sup>th</sup> grade is part of the elementary school or middle/high school.</p> <p>There was not evidence that in all grades and in all core content areas that the charter has implemented curricula that are aligned to statewide standards. Evidence suggested</p>

# Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy Charter

## Renewal Report | 2018

	<p>that some core subjects in some grade levels have been aligned. Interviews suggested that there is not a consistent process to align to standards at all grade levels, particularly in the middle/high school level. For 2017-18, in some grade levels for some subjects, teachers are documenting curriculum in an online platform. Administrators state that the work to utilize the online platform for curriculum mapping and alignment is new and ongoing.</p> <p>The charter has submitted all required information via statewide data reporting tools including but not limited to TCS, enrollment and attendance.</p> <p>The charter's school calendar complies with the required length of school day and year.</p>
<i>School Leadership (3.17-3.19)</i>	<p>The charter met expectations in each of the criteria associated with this compliance area. The board's bylaws were updated in 2017 and include a conflicts of interest policy. The committee structure outlined in the bylaws was re-established according to January 2018 board minutes. The board files its meeting agendas with the Secretary of State and meetings are open to the public as required by state law. A stakeholder complaints policy is present in staff handbooks.</p> <p>However, as noted in criteria 2.5, the process for communicating and addressing complaints is not consistent, clear or well understood for all stakeholders.</p>
<i>Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)</i>	<p>In 2015-16, the charter did not meet expectations in criteria 3.21, 3.22, and 3.23. In 2016-17, the charter did not meet expectations in criteria 3.27 and 3.28, and in 2017-18, the charter did not meet expectations in criteria 3.27 and 3.28</p> <p>In 2015-16, Times<sup>2</sup> was egregiously late in filing its required quarterly financial reports, UCOA reports and AUP audit. In 2015-16 and 2016-17, the school's auditors noted significant deficiencies and material weaknesses in Times<sup>2</sup>'s fiscal controls.</p> <p>The organization has had inconsistency in business managers and financial management over the course of the charter term. The current business manager, who began as a consultant in the summer of 2017, is responsible for monitoring the charter's budget and fiscal health. The board's treasurer in conjunction with the business manager reports financial items to the board and relies on reports of the Business Manager and audit firm. The finance committee has been inconsistent over the course of the charter term and met once during the 2017-18 school year. The current business manager has worked this year to set up systems and processes to manage the organization's finances. The business manager works primarily with each Dean for budget planning and provides regular financial statements directly to the board.</p>





## Times<sup>2</sup> Incorporated

Unite, Educate and Succeed in the areas of Engineering, Math, Science and Technology

### Recommendation Response

Mid-year in 2015-2016 and in the middle of this charter renewal term the Board decided to make a management change and go in a different direction with a new Executive Director. Since that change there have been a number of personnel changes at the school in the dean's, business manager, and guidance positions. These changes came as a result of discovered deficiencies in academic, management or programmatic areas within the organization. The organization has also added a number of new positions over this same period to better serve the learning community.

#### Academic Performance:

TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated has been aware of the academic performance issues during this charter renewal term. TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated has a data specialist on staff. The data specialist has prepared data reports for the deans and executive director during the charter renewal term. The Board and executive director have engaged in regular academic progress monitoring as evidenced by weekly dean meeting agendas, board presentations, and monthly project plan meeting notes focusing on student data and achievement. School Improvement plans have been created for both the elementary and secondary divisions during the charter renewal term. This past fall TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated has contracted with the nationally recognized Phi Delta Kappa to conduct a CMSi Curriculum Audit of the TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy's comprehensive educational program. The purpose of this CMSi Curriculum Audit is to evaluate existing processes, programs and services to determine if the Academy is experiencing success in delivering a quality instructional program that is indeed improving student achievement for all subgroups. No amount of inspired teaching is adequate if student achievement—measured learning—does not improve. The audit is set to begin in January 2019. Based on the results of this comprehensive audit TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated will work with its entire learning community to develop the comprehensive STEM focused curriculum plan to close the achievement gaps at each grade level.

#### Organizational Performance:

During the charter renewal term TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated engaged in the following work at the Board level:

- In the 2016 - 2017 academic year the Board revised and adopted its revised bylaws.
- In the 2016 – 2017 academic year the Board wrote and adopted a new 5-year strategic plan.
- In the 2017- 2018 academic year the Board retooled some key committees to address specific aspects of the organization.
- In the 2018 – 2019 academic year the committee dates have been set for the calendar year.

The vote of no confidence issued by the faculty of TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy in June 2018, came directly after the Rhode Island Superior Court denied a temporary injunction filed by teachers against TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated regarding TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated's summer enrichment program. The Board discussed the vote of no confidence once it was brought to the Board's attention but decided not to address the issue in public until after it had more information about the issues mentioned in the document presented by teachers. Ultimately, it became clear that teachers simply wanted to feel more included in the decision-making process for the school.

Therefore, with the Board's input, during the summer of 2018 the Comer School Development Program was contacted to help the school community with its school governance model. This Comer model was mentioned as the governance model of choice in the school's original charter. Dates were scheduled to begin the process at the beginning of the school year. However, at the start of the 2018 school year, the teachers were under Work



## Times<sup>2</sup> Incorporated

Unite, Educate and Succeed in the areas of Engineering, Math, Science and Technology

to Rule due to a break down in contractual negotiations between PPSD and PTU and would not attend any meetings held after school. Work to Rule was lifted at the end of November. The Comer School Development Program was re-engaged. The work is set to begin January of 2019.

At the beginning of the 2018-2019 academic year communications protocols for faculty and staff were also created and shared with the entire learning community and can be viewed at the following link. As to communication with the Board, the faculty staff and the entire learning community have for years availed themselves of the established public comment portion of the Board meetings. All Board meetings are publicly advertised, and all have always been welcome to address the Board.

### **Compliance:**

During the charter term TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated has had some transition in the business office. These transitions have had a significant impact on the timely issuance of the financial statements, accounting functions, the number of journal entries and number of management letter comments during the audit process. However, the current team with the guidance of the treasurer and the Board of directors has focused their attention on addressing process improvement as well as attention to fiscal controls. The management comments, were reduced from 15 comments to 4 comments by June 30, 2018. In addition to the improvements impacting management comments, the number of audit adjustments were reduced as well.

The Agreed Upon Procedures reporting has also shown significant improvement in the last several years. The allocation requirements related to the Uniform Chart of Accounts are complex and coupled with personnel transition can result in exceptions related to learning the methodologies and allocations that apply to transactions. As noted below, Times2, Inc. has improved these results in June 30, 2017.

In addition to the above, the RIDE Fiscal Health Measures included in the Charter School Performance Review Handbook are evaluated annually by TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated. and the results have reflected that it “meets the standard” or “approaches the standard” for each of the requirements.

TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy’s Special Education population is supported by the Providence Public School Department. The district supports TIMES<sup>2</sup> with three full time special educators, an intervention specialist who serves as LEA one day per week and a Special Education Supervisor who is available for ongoing support. Although the school is currently in compliance, TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated is currently reevaluating if this current arrangement is adequate for the needs of the students that attend the Academy.

As noted TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy is working with RIDE to correct our English Language Learner program.

### **Final word:**

TIMES<sup>2</sup> Incorporated is committed to addressing the sustainability concerns outlined in the recommendations and will give the evidence and ongoing progress reports for the duration of the charter term for TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy.

The mission of TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy is to develop intellectually curious and capable young people who are selfless contributors to the local and global community, and who aspire to be ethical and compassionate leaders. Through a rigorous and innovative academic program in STEM in combination with the liberal arts, TIMES<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy affords its diverse student population those experiences, skills, and values that will prepare them for purposeful contribution to higher education and STEM related fields and meaningful personal growth.

50 Fillmore Street, Providence, RI 02908 ~ 401-272-5094, Fax 401-272-0555

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times2 STEM Academy 2015-16

### Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	A.1 is rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND A.2 is rated as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The school's composite index score was 75 and RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2015-16.

### Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Not Rated</b>		Academic Performance: School Comparison is only rated when a school receives a rating of "Approaches" or "Does Not Meet" for the Academic Performance: School Performance Annual Rating.

### Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
<i>1.1 Current Ratio</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio was 2.62
<i>1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash</i>	<b>Not Rated</b>		Days of Cash is not reported for District Charters

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times2 STEM Academy 2015-16

<i>1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.36.
<i>1.4 Total Margin &amp; 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	Aggregated three-year total margin was 0.02 and the most recent year's total margin was 0.005.
<i>1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio</i>	<b>Not Rated</b>		Debt Service Coverage Ratio will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.

### Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND 2.3 is rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
<i>2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals</i>	<b>Not Rated</b>		<b>RIDE did not establish school specific goals in academic year 2015-16.</b>
<i>2.2 School Environment</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE AND There is evidence that the school	<b>Family engagement:</b> The school provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report. <i>Student attendance rate and student retention will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.</i>

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times2 STEM Academy 2015-16

		regularly engages parents and families. AND at least 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year.	
2.3 Equity and Access	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	<p>There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND</p> <p>There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND</p> <p>There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.</p>	<p><b>Recruitment &amp; Lottery:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle.</p> <p><i>Use of attrition data &amp; applicant pool composition will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.</i></p>
2.4 Dissemination	<b>Not Rated</b>		Dissemination efforts will be reported on beginning in the 16-17 school year.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and	<p><b>Board &amp; School Leader Continuous Improvement:</b> The school provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Board &amp; School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/</b></p>

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times2 STEM Academy 2015-16

		regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	<p><b>Communication:</b> The school provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Board Holds School Leader Accountable:</b> The school provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>
--	--	---	--

### Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	Three or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet."	Criteria 3.21, 3.22, 3.23, 3.27 and 3.28 were rated as "Does Not Meet." All other criteria of this indicator were rated as "Meets Expectations."
<i>Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Office for Civil Rights:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>IDEA:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>Title III (English Language Learners):</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.</p>

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times2 STEM Academy 2015-16

			<p><b>Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income):</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>Enrollment Procedures:</b> The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.</p>
Employee Management (3.6 - 3.8)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Educator Certification:</b> A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues.</p> <p><b>HR Procedures:</b> The school provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Educator Evaluation:</b> A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.</p>
Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Facility Assurances:</b> <i>Facility Assurances will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.</i></p> <p><b>School Health Services:</b> No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report.</p> <p><b>Food Service:</b> <i>Food Service will not be a factor of this indicator until the 16-17 school year.</i></p> <p><b>Behavior &amp; Safety Policies:</b> The school provided evidence of behavior and safety policies in the Annual School Health Report.</p>
Educational Program (3.13-3.16)	Meets Expectations	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Educational Program:</b> The school provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Curriculum Standards:</b> The school provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>



# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times2 STEM Academy 2015-16

			<p><b>Data Reporting:</b> No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting.</p> <p><b>School Day/Length Policy:</b> The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report..</p>
<i>School Leadership (3.17-3.19)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:</b> The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Board Bylaws:</b> The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:</b> The school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>
<i>Financial Management (3.20 - 3.29)</i>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<p>The school's auditors determined the school had "significant deficiencies, or equivalents."</p> <p>The school's auditors determined the school had "material weaknesses," or equivalents.</p>	<p><b>Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:</b> The charter complied with budget submissions.</p> <p><b>Quarterly Financial Reporting:</b> The charter did not comply with the requirements for quarterly reports</p> <p><b>UCOA Reporting:</b> The charter did not comply with the requirements for UCOA reports and AUP audit submission.</p> <p><b>Annual Financial Audit:</b> The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified</p> <p><b>Significant Deficiencies and/or Material Weaknesses:</b> In the draft management letter accompanying the FY15 audit, the school's auditors identified one material weaknesses and one significant deficiencies</p> <p><b>Single Audit:</b> N/A</p>



# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

### Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	A.1 is rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds." AND A.2 is rated as "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The School's composite index score was 70 and RIDE did not hold schools accountable to school specific goals in 2016-17

### Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Not Rated</b>		Academic Performance: School Comparison is only rated when a school receives a rating of "Approaches" or "Does Not Meet" for the Academic Performance: School Performance Annual Rating.

### Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations." Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2016-17, the ratings reflect the information in the FY16 audit for the organization.
<i>1.1 Current Ratio</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 1.63.
<i>1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School has 60 days or more of unrestricted cash on hand. OR School has between 30 and	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 244.08.

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

		60 days of cash and one-year trend is positive.	
<i>1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.36.
<i>1.4 Total Margin &amp; 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.06. The three year aggregate margin was 0.03.
<i>1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School's debt service coverage ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1	The debt service coverage ratio was 2.05.

### Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets" or "Exceeds."	Criterion 2.2 was rated "Exceeds Expectations" and all other criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
<i>2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals</i>	<b>Not Rated</b>		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2016-17.
<i>2.2 School Environment</i>	<b>Exceeds Expectations</b>	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the	<b>Student Attendance:</b> The school's attendance rate was 93.75%, greater than the state average of 93.27%

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

		state's average attendance rate as published by RIDE and there is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families and at least 80% of students in non-break grades return to school the next year and the school's waitlist comprises at least 50% of available seats for the current school year.	<p><b>Family engagement:</b> The charter provided assurances of family engagement in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Student Retention:</b> More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.</p> <p><b>Waitlist:</b> The school's waitlist comprises more than 50% of seats available.</p>
2.3 Equity and Access	Meets Expectations	<p>There is evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations. AND There is evidence that the school implements recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district. AND</p> <p>There is evidence that the applicant pool is representative of its sending communities, in line with the school's charter.</p>	<p><b>Attrition Data:</b> The charter provided assurances of attrition data analysis in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Recruitment &amp; Lottery:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. The school provided lottery data; lottery monitoring was not conducted for this review cycle.</p> <p><b>Applicant Pool:</b> The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2017 lottery shows applicants from Providence.</p>
2.4 Dissemination	Meets	There is no evidence that a	<b>Sharing and Partnership:</b> The charter provided assurances and

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

	<b>Expectations</b>	school shares curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices	descriptions of work related to sharing resources and practice.
<i>2.5 Board and Leadership Quality</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	The board and school leader engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy. AND The board and school leader have and implement clear and well-understood systems for decision-making and communication processes. AND There is evidence that the Board holds the school leader accountable.	<p><b>Board &amp; School Leader Continuous Improvement:</b> The charter provided assurances of continuous improvement activities in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Board &amp; School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/Communication:</b> The charter provided assurances of decision making and communication systems in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Board Holds School Leader Accountable:</b> The charter provided assurances of holding school leader(s) accountable in the School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>

### Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
----------------------	-----------------	---------------------------	----------------------

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

Annual Rating	Approaches Expectations	One criterion associated with Federal law/ regulation is rated as "Does Not Meet." OR Two or more criteria are rated as "Does Not Meet."	Criteria 3.27 and 3.28 were rated "Does Not Meet." All other criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
<i>Student Rights</i> (3.1 - 3.5)	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<b>Office for Civil Rights:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. <b>IDEA:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted. <b>English Language Learners:</b> No outstanding issues were identified as reviewed online by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support. <b>Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income):</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted. <b>Enrollment Procedures:</b> The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery.
<i>Employee Management</i> (3.6 - 3.8)	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<b>Educator Certification:</b> A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues. <b>HR Procedures:</b> The charter provided assurances of documented employee rights in the employee handbook documents in their School-Prepared Annual Report. <b>Educator Evaluation:</b> A review of educator evaluation compliance identified no outstanding issues.

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

<i>Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Facility Documentation &amp; Assurances:</b> The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>School Health Services:</b> No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report.</p> <p><b>Food Service:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>Behavior &amp; Safety Policies:</b> The charter provided assurances of behavior and safety policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>
<i>Educational Program (3.13-3.16)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Educational Program:</b> The charter provided assurances of compliance with state, regulation and charter related educational program requirements in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Curriculum Standards:</b> The charter provided assurances that curriculum is aligned to state adopted standards in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Data Reporting:</b> No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting.</p> <p><b>School Day/Length Policy:</b> The charter school provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>
<i>School Leadership (3.17-3.19)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:</b> The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Board Bylaws:</b> The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:</b> The charter provided assurances of these policies in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p>



## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2016-17

<p><i>Financial Management</i> (3.20 - 3.29)</p>	<p><b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b></p>	<p>The school's auditors determined the school had "significant deficiencies, or equivalents."</p> <p>The school's auditors determined the school had "material weaknesses," or equivalents.</p>	<p><b>Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:</b> The charter complied with budget submissions.</p> <p><b>Quarterly Financial Reporting:</b> The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports.</p> <p><b>UCOA Reporting:</b> The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit.</p> <p><b>Annual Financial Audit:</b> The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified</p> <p><b>Significant Deficiencies and/or Material Weaknesses:</b> In the draft management letter accompanying the FY16 audit, the school's auditors identified six material weaknesses and six significant deficiencies</p> <p><b>Single Audit:</b> N/A</p>
--	--	--	---

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

### Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	1.A.1 is rated as "Approaches" and 1.A.2 is rated as "Exceeds", "Meets" or "Does Not Meet."	The school received a 2-star rating on the statewide school accountability system. The school did not set school specific goals in 2017-18.

### Primary Indicator: Academic Performance - School Comparison

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	For 1.A.2, 1.B.2 and 1.B.3, no more than one criterion is rated as "Does Not Meet" and all others are rated as "Approaches", "Meets" or "Exceeds." OR 1.B.1 is rated as "Approaches."	The school was rated as "Approaches Expectations" on criterion 1.B.1, 1.B.2 and 1.B.3.
<i>1.B.1 Proficiency Compared to Enrolling Districts</i>	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	The weighted average proficiency level of enrolling districts in either Math or ELA is equal to or within the charter school's performance range values.	<p>The weighted average proficiency of enrolling districts in both Math and ELA is within the charter school's performance range. (the charter school's math proficiency rate plus and minus the error value).</p> <p>Charter School's ELA proficiency: <math>20\% \pm \text{error } 2.9</math> = range from 17.1 – 22.9</p> <p>Weighted Average Proficiency of Enrolling Districts: 18.42%</p>

## Charter School Annual Performance Report Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

			Charter School's Math proficiency: 13% $\pm$ error 2.4 = range from 10.6 – 15.4 Weighted Average Proficiency of Enrolling Districts: 12.26%
<i>1.B.2 English Language Proficiency</i>	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	The school earned 2 ELP Progress points as measured by school index score published in the statewide school accountability system.	The school earned two ELP points as measured by the statewide accountability system. The school's ELP index score was 78.
<i>1.B.3 Growth</i>	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	The school earned 1 point for growth in either ELA or Math as published in the statewide school accountability system.	The school earned one point for growth in ELA, with a growth index of 0.78 and two points for growth in Math, with a growth index of 0.87.

### Sustainability Indicator 1: Financial Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	For 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, and 1.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Approaches" and all others are rated as "Meets."	All criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations." Calculations are determined using the results of most recently available audited financial statements. For 2017-2018, the ratings reflect the information in the FY17 audit for the organization.
<i>1.1 Current Ratio</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	Current ratio is equal to or greater than 1.	Current ratio in was 1.81
<i>1.2 Unrestricted Days of Cash</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School has 60 days or more of unrestricted cash on hand. OR School has between 30 and 60 days of cash and one-year trend is positive.	Unrestricted days of cash on hand was 168.18

## Charter School Annual Performance Report Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

1.3 Debt to Asset Ratio	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School's debt to asset ratio is less than 0.90	Debt to asset ratio was 0.31.
1.4 Total Margin & 3-Year Aggregate Total Margin	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	Aggregated three- year total margin is positive and the most recent year total margin is positive.	The most recent year's total margin was 0.05. The three-year aggregate margin was 0.0389.
1.5 Debt Service Coverage Ratio	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	School's debt service coverage ratio is greater than or equal to 1.1	The debt service coverage ratio was 2.20.

### Sustainability Indicator 2: Organizational Performance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	For 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, no more than one criterion is rated as "Does Not Meet" and all others are rated as "Approaches," "Meets" or "Exceeds."	Criterion 2.3 was rated "Approaches Expectations" and 2.5 was rated "Does Not Meet." All other criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets or Exceeds Expectations."
2.1 Organizational School-Specific Goals	<b>Not Rated</b>		School-specific goals were not established in academic year 2017-18.
2.2 School Environment	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	The school's attendance rate equal to or greater than the state's average attendance rate as	<b>Student Attendance:</b> The school's attendance rate was 93.55%, greater than the state average of 93.24% <b>Family engagement:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school engages parents and families.

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

		published by RIDE. AND There is evidence that the school regularly engages parents and families. AND At least 80% of students in non-break grades* return to school the next year.	However, as noted in the renewal report, other evidence demonstrates that parent communication and engagement are inconsistent across school levels. <b>Student Retention:</b> More than 80% of students enrolled at the end of the previous school year were also enrolled at the beginning of the following year.
2.3 Equity and Access	<b>Approaches Expectations</b>	<p>One of the following is true: There is no evidence the school is analyzing attrition data and is using attrition analysis in decision-making including ensuring that attrition is not occurring disproportionately for specific populations.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Evidence suggests that the school has not implemented recruitment, lottery and retention policies and procedures that address all populations in their sending district.</p> <p>---</p> <p>Evidence suggests that the applicant pool is not representative of its sending communities.</p>	<p><b>Attrition Data:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school tracks attrition data on an individual basis and monitors withdrawal trends.</p> <p><b>Recruitment &amp; Lottery:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school has not implemented recruitment policies and procedures to ensure the school is addressing all populations in their sending district. The March 1, 2018 lottery was monitored.</p> <p><b>Applicant Pool:</b> The charter's applicant pool as submitted from the CSAR from the March 1, 2018 lottery shows applicants from Providence.</p>

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

2.4 Dissemination	Exceeds Expectations	There is evidence that a school shares curricular and/or instructional resources and/or best practices with multiple partners or through multiple modalities.	<b>Sharing and Partnership:</b> Document review and the renewal site visit showed the charter established an Institute to focus on offering professional development in STEM for underrepresented populations, including: topic-specific PD, STEM talks open to the public, partnerships with higher education and presentations at national and local conferences. The organization has appointed a director of the institute who shares regular reports and project progress with the Executive Director and the Charter's board.
2.5 Board and Leadership Quality	Does Not Meet Expectations	<p>Two or more of the following are true:  The board or school leader do not engage in strategic and continuous improvement planning by setting, and regularly monitoring progress relative to: student academic success, priorities that are aligned with the school's mission, and educational philosophy.</p> <p>----</p> <p>The board or school leader does not have and implement clear and well understood systems for decision-making and communication processes.</p> <p>----</p> <p>There is no evidence that</p>	<p><b>Board &amp; School Leader Continuous Improvement:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board and school leader do not engage in regular academic progress monitoring.</p> <p><b>Board &amp; School Leader Have Systems for Decision-making/Communication:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board and school leader do not implement clear systems for decision-making and communication. Including stakeholders noting desire for better communication and establishing protocols, board committees inconsistently activated,</p> <p><b>Board Holds School Leader Accountable:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board uses an evaluation tool to evaluated the Executive Director annually. The ED, in turn, conducts evaluations for the school administrators.</p>

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

		the Board holds the school leader accountable.	
--	--	--	--

### Sustainability Indicator 3: Compliance

Indicator / Criteria	School's Rating	Rubric Rating Description	School Rating Detail
<b>Annual Rating</b>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	Three or more criteria were rated as "Does Not Meet."	Criteria 3.2, 3.3, 3.13, 3.14, 3.27 and 3.28 were rated "Does Not Meet." All other criteria of this indicator have been rated "Meets Expectations."
<i>Student Rights (3.1 - 3.5)</i>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<p>3.2 There is an unresolved material violation with laws and regulations relating to IDEA (Special Education) as reviewed by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support.</p> <p>3.8 There is an unresolved material violation of laws and regulations relating to Title III (English Learners) as reviewed by the Office of Student, Community and Academic Support.</p>	<p><b>3.1: Office for Civil Rights:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>3.2: IDEA:</b> The RIDE Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports found Times<sup>2</sup> to be non-compliant with regard to delivering services documented in a student's IEP in a timely manner or in an appropriate environment.</p> <p><b>3.3: English Language Learners:</b> Times<sup>2</sup> had initiated a request for assistance based on concerns about the screening, evaluation and provision of EL services, particularly the high number of ELs that were waived from EL services due to eligibility for special education services. Times<sup>2</sup> has identified a coordinator for EL services and she has requested technical assistance from the RIDE, Office of Student, Community and Academic Supports. The elementary level has implemented an action plan based on the concerns discovered through technical assistance. Simultaneously,</p>



## Charter School Annual Performance Report Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

			<p>the United States Department of Justice conducted a thorough review of Providence Public Schools' EL programs and services in early 2018. This review found several conditions of the district's EL programming that violate Section 1703(f) of the Equal Educational Opportunities Act. As a district charter school, Times2 would fall under the agreements reached between the US Department of Justice and the Providence Public Schools for addressing compliance matters of the Consent Decree.</p> <p><b>3.4: Title I (High Enrollment Low-Income):</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency review cycle, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>3.5: Enrollment Procedures:</b> The school used RI Lottery form, submitted charter applicant report and has policies in place for conducting fair and equitable school lottery. The March 1, 2018 lottery was monitored.</p>
<p><i>Employee Management</i> (3.6 - 3.8)</p>	<p><b>Meets Expectations</b></p>	<p>No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.</p>	<p><b>3.6: Educator Certification:</b> A review of certification compliance identified no outstanding issues.</p> <p><b>3.7: HR Procedures:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of the school using the employee handbook for Providence Public Schools.</p> <p><b>3.8: Educator Evaluation:</b> While a review of educator evaluation compliance identified inconsistencies with the evaluation data report, the school noted that for 2017-18 it did not have a building administrator complete an evaluation. The elementary administrator was new in the middle of the year and the middle-high administrator has been on leave for the majority of the year. The process will be completed for the elementary and any permanent middle/high administrator.</p>

## Charter School Annual Performance Report

### Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

<i>Health and Safety (3.9-3.12)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance indicator.	<p><b>3.9: Facility Documentation &amp; Assurances:</b> The charter provided assurances of facilities inspections and documentation in their School-Prepared Annual Report.</p> <p><b>3.10: School Health Services:</b> No outstanding issues were identified in a review of the Annual School Health Report.</p> <p><b>3.11: Food Service:</b> No outstanding issues were identified. Per agency practice, a formal review was not conducted.</p> <p><b>3.12: Behavior &amp; Safety Policies:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of student handbooks for both school levels that include a code of conduct, bullying, student discipline and safety procedures.</p>
<i>Educational Program (3.13-3.16)</i>	<b>Does Not Meet Expectations</b>	<p>3.13: There is not evidence that the school is practicing essential educational program components as defined by the school's charter, state law and regulation.</p> <p>3.14: There is not sufficient evidence that for all grades and in all core-content area subjects, the school implemented curricula that are aligned to statewide standards</p>	<p><b>3.13: Educational Program:</b> There was not evidence from document review and the renewal site visit of an integrated STEM focus at all grade levels, particularly in the elementary school level. There was lack of clarity and coherence in the high school course schedules and the organization of the 6<sup>th</sup> grade level.</p> <p><b>3.14: Curriculum Standards:</b> Through document review and the renewal site visit, there was not evidence of curricula aligned to statewide standards in all grades and in all core content areas. There was not evidence of a process or ongoing work to align standards at all grade levels.</p> <p><b>3.15: Data Reporting:</b> No outstanding issues were identified in educational program related reporting.</p> <p><b>3.16: School Day/Length Policy:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the school has adopted and implemented these policies.</p>
<i>School Leadership (3.17-3.19)</i>	<b>Meets Expectations</b>	No unresolved material violations of law, regulation, rule or requirement as described in the Compliance Performance	<p><b>3.17: Open Meetings and Ethics Policy:</b> There is evidence from school assurances, document review, and the renewal site visit that the board complied with posting agendas and minutes for public meetings, public record requests and the Code of Ethics.</p>

# Charter School Annual Performance Report

## Times<sup>2</sup> STEM Academy | 2017-18

		indicator.	<p><b>3.18: Board Bylaws:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that the board maintains and implements its bylaws.</p> <p><b>3.19: Conflict of Interest/Complaint Management:</b> There is evidence from document review and the renewal site visit that a stakeholder complaints process is present in staff handbooks. However, the process for communicating and addressing complaints is not clear or well-understood across stakeholders.</p>
Financial Management (3.20 - 3.28)	Does Not Meet Expectations	<p>3.26: The school's auditors determined the school had "significant deficiencies, or equivalents."</p> <p>3.27: The school's auditors determined the school had "material weaknesses," or equivalents.</p>	<p><b>3.20: Annual Budget Submission/ Revisions:</b> The charter complied with budget submissions.</p> <p><b>3.21: Quarterly Financial Reporting:</b> The charter complied with Quarterly financial reports.</p> <p><b>3.22-3.23: UCOA Reporting:</b> The charter complied with required UCOA reports and AUP Audit.</p> <p><b>3.24-3.27: Annual Financial Audit:</b> The charter's audit was unqualified/unmodified. In the management letter accompanying the FY17 audit identified five material weaknesses and six significant deficiencies</p> <p><b>3.28: Single Audit:</b> N/A</p>